

Serial No. 10/043,140
October 8, 2003
Reply to the Office Action dated April 14, 2003
Page 13 of 15

inductor which includes two bonding wires 155c and 155d, **NOT** merely one bonding wire 155c, as alleged by the Examiner (see col. 19, line 66 through col. 20, line 16 of Ushiroku et al.). Although, the bonding wire 155c is shorter than the bonding wires 155a and 155b connected to the first parallel arm resonator 23, the other bonding wire 155d connected to the second parallel arm resonator 25, which is a component of the inductor connected to the second parallel arm resonator 25, is clearly much longer than the bonding wires 155a and 155b.

Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that the combined length of the bonding wires 155c and 155d connected to the second parallel arm resonator 25 is clearly longer than the combined length of the bonding wires 155a and 155b connected to the first parallel arm resonator 23. Since the inductance of a bonding wire inductor increases with an increase in the length of the bonding wire, the inductance of the inductor (bonding wires 155c and 155d) connected to the second parallel arm resonator is greater than the inductance of the inductor (bonding wires 155a and 155b) connected to the first parallel arm resonator 23, **NOT equal to or less than** the inductance of the inductor (bonding wires 155a and 155b) connected to the first parallel arm resonator 23 as recited in the present claimed invention.

In addition, Ushiroku et al. fails to teach or suggest anything at all about the relative inductances of the inductor connected to the second parallel arm resonator and the inductor connected to the first parallel arm resonator, and certainly fails to teach or suggest that "the inductor of said plurality of inductors that is connected to said second parallel arm resonator has an inductance that is substantially equal to or less than the inductance of the inductor of said plurality of inductors connected to said first parallel arm resonator" as recited in the present claimed invention.

Prior art rejections must be based on evidence. Graham v. John Deere Co., 383 U.S. 117 (1966). Pursuant to MPEP 706.02(a), the Examiner is hereby requested to cite a reference in support of his position that it was well known at the time of Applicant's invention to configure the inductors such that "the inductor of said plurality of